Serial No. 10/658,422 Reply to Office Action dated <u>July 19, 2005</u> Docket No. KAGEI-0100-DIV

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant has canceled claims 28-30 without prejudice or disclaimer and added new claims 31-32. Therefore claims 31-32 are now pending in the application. Claims 31-32 are not believed to raise a question of new matter.

Claim Rejections

Claims 28-30 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousnesstype double patenting as unpatentable over claims 1-5 of U.S. Patent No. 6,821,906 B2. These claims have been cancelled, thus rendering the rejections of these claims moot.

New claims 31-32 are believed to be patentably distinct from the claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,821,906 B2 and the cited prior art. New claim 31 adds the new features of "dry washing the substrate¹," "decomposing organic substances deposited on the surface of the substrate with the dielectric barrier discharge lamp²," "wet washing step the substrate to remove inorganic contaminants by supplying washing water on the surface of the substrate³," and "drying the substrate to eliminate washing water from the substrate surface⁴." New claim 32 adds the new features of "drying the substrate to eliminate washing water from the substrate surface⁵," "placing the substrate in a mixed atmosphere of an inert gas and water to improve the contact angle of the substrate surface⁶," and "coating the surface of the substrate with a liquid developer⁷." Support for these new claim features may be found in the specification as well as canceled

¹ See, for example, paragraph [0044]

² See, for example, paragraph [0044]

³ See, for example, paragraph [0045]

⁴ See, for example, paragraph [0072]

⁵ See, for example, paragraph [0044]

See, for example, paragraph [0074]

6 See, for example, paragraph [0074]

⁷ See, for example, paragraph [0074]

Oct 19 2005 6:25PM

1.703.991.7071

p.7

Serial No. 10/658,422

Reply to Office Action dated July 19, 2005

Docket No. KAGEI-0100-DIV

claims 28-30. Therefore these claims would not be subject to a double patenting

rejection based on U.S. Patent No. 6,821,906 B2.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted

that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that any

additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the

Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, at the telephone number listed

below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R.

1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the

filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit

Account 50-3136 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

Olds, Maier & Richardson, PLLC

Timothy J. Maier

Registration No. 51,986

128 N. Pitt St, 2nd Floor Alexandria, VA 22314 (888) 510-0695

Date: October 19, 2005